

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Examiner's rejection of claims 1, 3-11 and 13 dated August 13, 2003, has been carefully reviewed and the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration.

In particular, Applicant believes the phrase "perpendicular to the plane of rotation" is independent of point of reference. The rotation of the indexing plate is well defined and the plane of rotation would be understood to be a plane perpendicular to the axis of rotation. There can be only a single direction that is perpendicular to a plane.

Further, the amendment to claim 1 does not indicate that the "ejector plate" is perpendicular to the plane of rotation as suggested by the Examiner's response, but rather that the injector plate (stripper plate in the claim) engages the molded part from the direction perpendicular to the plane of rotation of the indexing plate.

Given this limitation, the Schad reference does not teach an ejector plate engaging the part from a direction perpendicular to the plane of rotation as required of the claim. Referring to Fig. 1, and the accompanying text, the stripper plate 34 of Schad engages the molded work pieces 42 in a direction parallel, not perpendicular to the plane of rotation of the indexing plate. As shown in Fig. 3, this requires the stripper plate 34 to be pre-engaged with the mold core prior to the molding operation, and requires that the stripper plate rotate with the indexing plate requiring a more complex mechanism than that required by the present invention.

The Tate reference does not remedy the deficiencies of Schad and appears to be a blow molding rather than an injection molding device. While the Tate reference specifically notes that the apparatus may use a suitable ejection apparatus, the ejection apparatus is not shown. Applicant cannot confirm that an ejection system approaching the part from a direction perpendicular to its rotational plane is taught.

Accordingly, it is believed that the combination of the references Tate and Schad, in fact, do not teach the limitations now claimed and teach away from this by showing a device that apparently requires a stripper plate to ride around with the mold as it rotates.

Appl. No. 09/819,365
Amdt. Dated September 12, 2003
Reply to Office Action dated August 13, 2003

In light of these comments, it is respectfully requested that claims 1, 3-11 and 13 now be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,

Jeffrey E. Callen, *et al.*

By: 

Keith M. Baxter
Reg. No. 31,233
Attorney for Applicant
Quarles & Brady LLP
411 E. Wisconsin Avenue
Milwaukee WI 53202-4497
(414) 277-5719